Smoke-Free Workplace Fact Sheet, 2004

Why Go Smoke-Free? Why Help your Employees Quit? Lost Productivity Former smokers have low rates of absenteeism.⁶ Smoking-related illness led to about \$81.9 billion in productivity losses from 1995-1999 Smokers have twice the accident rate of nonsmokers possibly due to lack of attention span. in the U.S.¹ irritation of the eyes and throat causing coughing and watery eyes; and higher carbon monoxide • A smoking employee costs the employer at least \$1,000 more than a nonsmoking employee levels lowering oxygen saturation, which may contribute to decreased alertness and reflex speed.⁷ every year in absenteeism, reduced productivity, and higher health, fire, and life insurance.² Exposure to secondhand smoke contributes to unemployment, disability, and worker's compensation for illness and loss of work.8 Absenteeism Health Effects of Smoking in the Workplace • About 19% of all absenteeism in the workplace is due to smoking-related illnesses; amounting to over 80 million absences per year in the U.S.³ Toxins in tobacco smoke kill over 440,000 people per year in the United States.⁸ During a one-year period of exposure to secondhand smoke, non-smoking employees are more likely than unexposed employees to take time off sick and require treatment for It is estimated that exposure to secondhand smoke in nonsmokers accounts for as many as 62,000 respiratory problems. deaths per year from coronary heart disease.9 Secondhand smoke exposure causes over 3,000 lung cancer deaths annually, as well as Costs exacerbation of lung disease in nonsmoking adults and respiratory problems in children.⁸ Smoking in the workplace can result in a combined damaging effect when smokers are also Insurance claims average \$300 per year more for smokers than nonsmokers.⁵ exposed to workplace chemicals and other toxic agents. Accidents resulting from smoking can cost employers \$45 per person per year due to injury and workers' compensation costs.5 **Workplace Smoking Policies** Benefits • 71% of Kentuckians report that smoking is banned inside their workplace. Of those who said workplace smoking was permitted, 59% reported that indoor workplace smoking areas were • Banning smoking in the workplace can reduce health and fire insurance premiums by enclosed and ventilated. 10 over 25% and decrease disability and early retirement payments by 75%.⁵ • Requiring all workplaces to be smoke free would reduce employee smoking by 10%. 11 Ventilation costs for indoor smoking areas can be eliminated when adopting a smoke-• If all workplaces in the United States implemented smoke-free policies, about 178,000 smokers free workplace.5

cigarettes per year. 12

Sources

- 1. http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/research_data/economics/mmwr5114.highlights.htm
- 2. Berman K. Firms hope smoking bans will trim health costs. Business Insurance. October 12, 1987; 21(41):16-17.
- 3. Nixon JC, West JF. Cost reductions from a smoking policy. Employee Benefits Journal. 1989; 14(1):26-30

Businesses that ban smoking report reduced office cleaning costs, and equipment such as

- 4. McGhee, S., Adab, P., Hedley, A., Lam, T., Ho, L., Fielding, R & Wong, C. (2000).

 Passive smoking at work: the short-term cost, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*; 54: 673 676
- 5. http://ash.org/papers/h100.htm
- Halpern, M., Shikiar, R., Rentz, A., Khan, Z., (2001) Impact of smoking status on workplace absenteeism and productivity. *Tobacco Control*; 10: 233-238
- 7. http://www.lungusa.org/occupational/smoking workplace.html

computers lasts as much as 60% longer. 3

- 8. http://www.lungusa.org/tobacco/workplace
- 9. Wells AJ. Heart disease from passive smoking in the workplace. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. Jan 1998; 31(1):1-9.

would stop smoking and while those who continued to smoke would consume 10 billion fewer

- 10. University of Kentucky Survey, 2000
- 11. Farrelly, M., Evans, W., & Sfekas, A. (1999). The impact of workplace smoking bans: results from a national survey *Tobacco Control*: 8:272-277
- Glasgow R, Cummings K, Hyland A. Relationship of worksite smoking policy to changes in employee tobacco use: Findings from COMMIT. *Tobacco Control*. 1997; 6 (supp. 2):S44-S48

For more information please contact:

Ellen J. Hahn, D.N.S., R.N.
College of Nursing, University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40536-0232
(859) 257-2358
ejhahn00@email.uky.edu